arXiv:1111.0577v4 [math.GR] 22 Jun 2012

Definable sets in a hyperbolic group

Olga Kharlampovich [*]and Alexei Myasnikov [†]

June 15, 2012

Abstract

We give a description of definable sets $P = (p_1, \dots, p_m)$ in a free non-abelian group F and in a torsion-free non-elementary hyperbolic group G that follows from our work on the Tarski problems. This answers Malcev's question for F. As a corollary we show that proper non-cyclic subgroups of F and G are not definable and prove Bestvina and Feighn's result that definable subsets $P = (p)$ in a free group are either negligible or co-negligible in their terminology.

1 Introduction

Let F be a free group with finite basis or a torsion-free non-elementary hyperbolic group G. We consider formulas in the language L_A that contains generators of F (or G) as constants. In this paper we give a description of subsets of F^m (resp. G^m) definable in F (resp. G) that follows from [5] (problem of Malcev for F [6]). This description implies that definable subsets in F are either negligible or co-negligible (Bestvina and Feighn's result). As a corollary we show that proper non-cyclic subgroups of F and G are not definable.

Notice that in the language L_A every finite system of equations is equivalent to one equation (this is Malcev's result for F, see also Lemma 3 in [4]) and every finite disjunction of equations is equivalent to one equation (this is attributed to Gurevich for F, see also Lemma 4 in [4]). For G the proof is similar.

Theorem 1. *[8],[5] Every formula in the theory of F is equivalent to a boolean combination of $\forall\exists$-formulas.*

Furthermore, a more precise result holds.

Theorem 2. *Every set definable in F is defined by some boolean combination of formulas*

$$\exists X \forall Y (U(P, X) = 1 \wedge V(P, X, Y) \neq 1), \tag{1}$$

where X, Y, P are tuples of variables.

The proof will be given in Section 3. We call these formulas *conjunctive $\exists\forall$-formulas.*

Definition 1. *A* piece *of a word $u \in F$ is a non-trivial subword v that appears in two different ways (maybe the second time as v^{-1}).*

A piece *of a tuple of reduced words $(u_1, \dots, u_m)$, $u_j \in F$ is a non-trivial subword v that appears in two different ways as a subword of some words of $u_1, \dots, u_m$.*

---

[*] Hunter College, CUNY and McGill University, supported by CUNY grant

[†] Stevens Institute of Technology, supported by NSF grant

Definition 2. *A proper subset P of F admits parametrization if it is a set of all words p that satisfy a given system of equations (with coefficients) without cancellations in the form*

$$p \overset{\circ}{=} w_t(y_1, \dots, y_n), t = 1, \dots, k, \tag{2}$$

where for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, $y_i \neq 1$, each y_i appears at least twice in the system and each variable y_i in w_1 is a piece of p.

A proper subset P of F^m admits parametrization if after permutation of indices it is a product set of $F^k, k < m$ and a set of all tuples of words $p_j, j = 1, \dots, m-k$ that satisfy a given system of equations (with coefficients) without cancellations in the form

$$p_j \overset{\circ}{=} w_{tj}(y_1, \dots, y_n), t = 1, \dots, k_j, \tag{3}$$

where for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, $y_i \neq 1$, each y_i appears at least twice in the system and each variable y_i in each w_{1j} is a piece of the tuple.

The empty set and one-element subsets of F^m admit parametrization.

A finite union of sets admitting parametrization will be called a multipattern. *A subset of a multipattern will be called* a sub-multipattern

The following theorem will be proved in Section 4.

Theorem 3. *Suppose an $\exists$-set $P \subseteq F^m$ is not the whole group F^m and is defined by the formula*

$$\psi(P) = \exists Y U(Y, P) = 1,$$

then it is a multipattern.

Suppose an $\exists$-set P is defined by the formula

$$\psi_1(P) = \exists Y (U(Y, P) = 1 \wedge V(Y, P) \neq 1).$$

If the positive formula $\psi(P) = \exists Y (U(Y, P) = 1$ does not define the whole group F^m , then P is a sub-multipattern, otherwise either $\neg P$ or P is a sub-multipattern.

The following theorem and corollaties will be proved in Section 5.

Theorem 4. *For every definable in F set $P \subseteq F^m$, P or its complement $\neg P$ is a sub-multipattern.*

Corollary 1. *Proper non-cyclic subgroups of F are not definable.*

Corollary 2. *The set of primitive elements of F is not definable if $rank(F) > 2$.*

This and Proposition 1 below imply the solution to Malcev's problem 1.19 from [6] posed in 1965. The results on hyperbolic groups will be presented in the last section.

2 Cut Equations

We will use the notion of a cut equation introduced in [4], Section 5.7.

Definition 3. *A cut equation $\Pi = (\mathcal{E}, M, X, f_M, f_X)$ consists of a set of intervals $\mathcal{E}$, a set of variables M, a set of parameters X, and two labeling functions*

$$f_X : \mathcal{E} \to F[X], \quad f_M : \mathcal{E} \to F[M].$$

For an interval $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}$ the image $f_M(\sigma) = f_M(\sigma)(M)$ is a reduced word in variables $M^{\pm 1}$ and constants from F, we call it a partition of $f_X(\sigma)$.

Sometimes we write $\Pi = (\mathcal{E}, f_M, f_X)$ omitting M and X.

Definition 4. *A solution of a cut equation* $\Pi = (\mathcal{E}, f_M, f_X)$ *with respect to an* F*-homomorphism* $\beta : F[X] \to F$ *is an* F*-homomorphism* $\alpha : F[M] \to F$ *such that: 1) for every* $\mu \in M$ $\alpha(\mu)$ *is a reduced non-empty word; 2) for every reduced word* $f_M(\sigma)(M)$ $(\sigma \in \mathcal{E})$ *the replacement* $m \to \alpha(m)$ $(m \in M)$ *results in a word* $f_M(\sigma)(\alpha(M))$ *which is a reduced word as written and such that* $f_M(\sigma)(\alpha(M))$ *is graphically equal to the reduced form of* $\beta(f_X(\sigma))$*; in particular, the following diagram is commutative.*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& \mathcal{E} \arrow[dl, "f_X"'] \arrow[dr, "f_M"] & \\
F(X) \arrow[dr, "\beta"'] & & F(M) \arrow[dl, "\alpha"] \\
& F &
\end{tikzcd}$$

If $\alpha : F[M] \to F$ is a solution of a cut equation $\Pi = (\mathcal{E}, f_M, f_X)$ with respect to an F-homomorphism $\beta : F[X] \to F$, then we write (Π, β, α) and refer to α as a *solution of* Π *modulo* β. In this event, for a given $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}$ we say that $f_M(\sigma)(\alpha(M))$ is a *partition* of $\beta(f_X(\sigma))$. Sometimes we also consider homomorphisms $\alpha : F[M] \to F$, for which the diagram above is still commutative, but cancellation may occur in the words $f_M(\sigma)(\alpha(M))$. In this event we refer to α as a *group* solution of Π with respect to β.

Definition of a generalized equation can be found in [4].

Lemma 1 (Lemma 34,[4])**.** *For a generalized equation* $\Omega(H)$ *one can effectively construct a cut equation* $\Pi_\Omega = (\mathcal{E}, f_X, f_M)$ *such that the following conditions hold:*

1. *X is a partition of the whole interval* $[1, \rho_\Omega]$ *into disjoint closed subintervals;*
2. *M contains the set of variables H;*
3. *for any solution* $U = (u_1, \ldots, u_\rho)$ *of* Ω *the cut equation* Π_Ω *has a solution* α *modulo the canonical homomorphism* $\beta_U : F(X) \to F$ $(\beta_U(x) = u_i u_{i+1} \ldots u_j$ *where* i, j *are, correspondingly, the left and the right end-points of the interval* $x)$*;*
4. *for any solution* (β, α) *of the cut equation* Π_Ω *the restriction of* α *on* H *gives a solution of the generalized equation* Ω.

Proof. We begin with defining the sets X and M. Recall that a closed interval of Ω is a union of closed sections of Ω. Let X be an arbitrary partition of the whole interval $[1, \rho_\Omega]$ into closed subintervals (i.e., any two intervals in X are disjoint and the union of X is the whole interval $[1, \rho_\Omega]$).

Let B be a set of representatives of dual bases of Ω, i.e., for every base μ of Ω either μ or $\Delta(\mu)$ belongs to B, but not both. Put $M = H \cup B$.

Now let $\sigma \in X$. We denote by B_σ the set of all bases over σ and by H_σ the set of all items in σ. Put $S_\sigma = B_\sigma \cup H_\sigma$. For $e \in S_\sigma$ let $s(e)$ be the interval $[i, j]$, where $i < j$ are the endpoints of e. A sequence $P = (e_1, \ldots, e_k)$ of elements from S_σ is called a *partition* of σ if $s(e_1) \cup \cdots \cup s(e_k) = \sigma$ and $s(e_i) \cap s(e_j) = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. Let Part_σ be the set of all partitions of σ. Now put

$$\mathcal{E} = \{P \mid P \in \mathrm{Part}_\sigma, \sigma \in X\}.$$

Then for every $P \in \mathcal{E}$ there exists one and only one $\sigma \in X$ such that $P \in \mathrm{Part}_\sigma$. Denote this σ by $f_X(P)$. The map $f_X : P \to f_X(P)$ is a well-defined function from $\mathcal{E}$ into $F(X)$.

Each partition $P = (e_1, \ldots, e_k) \in \mathrm{Part}_\sigma$ gives rise to a word $w_P(M) = w_1 \ldots w_k$ as follows. If $e_i \in H_\sigma$ then $w_i = e_i$. If $e_i = \mu \in B_\sigma$ then $w_i = \mu^{\varepsilon(\mu)}$. If $e_i = \mu$ and $\Delta(\mu) \in B_\sigma$ then $w_i = \Delta(\mu)^{\varepsilon(\mu)}$. The map $f_M(P) = w_P(M)$ is a well-defined function from $\mathcal{E}$ into $F(M)$.

Now set $\Pi_\Omega = (\mathcal{E}, f_X, f_M)$. It is not hard to see from the construction that the cut equation Π_Ω satisfies all the required properties. Indeed, (1) and (2) follow directly from the construction.

To verify (3), let's consider a solution $U = (u_1, \ldots, u_{\rho_\Omega})$ of Ω. To define corresponding functions β_U and α, observe that the function $s(e)$ (see above) is defined for every $e \in X \cup M$. Now for $\sigma \in X$ put $\beta_U(\sigma) = u_i \ldots u_j$, where $s(\sigma) = [i,j]$, and for $m \in M$ put $\alpha(m) = u_i \ldots u_j$, where $s(m) = [i,j]$. Clearly, α is a solution of Π_Ω modulo β.

To verify (4) observe that if α is a solution of Π_Ω modulo β, then the restriction of α onto the subset $H \subset M$ gives a solution of the generalized equation Ω. This follows from the construction of the words w_p and the fact that the words $w_p(\alpha(M))$ are reduced as written (see definition of a solution of a cut equation). Indeed, if a base μ occurs in a partition $P \in \mathcal{E}$, then there is a partition $P' \in \mathcal{E}$ which is obtained from P by replacing μ by the sequence $h_i \ldots h_j$. Since there is no cancellation in words $w_P(\alpha(M))$ and $w_{P'}(\alpha(M))$, this implies that $\alpha(\mu)^{\varepsilon(\mu)} = \alpha(h_i \ldots h_j)$. This shows that α_H is a solution of Ω. □

Theorem 5 (Theorem 8, [4]). *Let $S(X,Y,A)) = 1$ be a system of equations over $F = F(A)$. Then one can effectively construct a finite set of cut equations*

$$\mathcal{CE}(S) = \{\Pi_i \mid \Pi_i = (\mathcal{E}_i, f_{X_i}, f_{M_i}), i = 1 \ldots, k\}$$

and a finite set of tuples of words $\{Q_i(M_i) \mid i = 1, \ldots, k\}$ such that:

1. *for every equation $\Pi_i = (\mathcal{E}_i, f_{X_i}, f_{M_i}) \in \mathcal{CE}(S)$, one has $X_i = X$ and $f_{X_i}(\mathcal{E}_i) \subset X^{\pm 1}$;*

2. *for any solution (U,V) of $S(X,Y,A) = 1$ in $F(A)$, there exists a number i and a tuple of words $P_{i,V}$ such that the cut equation $\Pi_i \in \mathcal{CE}(S)$ has a solution $\alpha : M_i \to F$ with respect to the F-homomorphism $\beta_U : F[X] \to F$ which is induced by the map $X \to U$. Moreover, $U = Q_i(\alpha(M_i))$, the word $Q_i(\alpha(M_i))$ is reduced as written, and $V = P_{i,V}(\alpha(M_i))$;*

3. *for any $\Pi_i \in \mathcal{CE}(S)$ there exists a tuple of words $P_{i,V}$ such that for any solution (group solution) (β, α) of Π_i the pair (U,V), where $U = Q_i(\alpha(M_i))$ and $V = P_{i,V}(\alpha(M_i))$, is a solution of $S(X,Y) = 1$ in F.*

Proof. Let $S(X,Y) = 1$ be a system of equations over a free group F. In [[4]], Section 4.4, we have constructed a set of initial parameterized generalized equations $\mathcal{GE}_{par}(S) = \{\Omega_1, \ldots, \Omega_r\}$ for $S(X,Y) = 1$ with respect to the set of parameters X. For each $\Omega \in \mathcal{GE}_{par}(S)$ in [[4]],Section 8, we constructed the finite tree $T_{sol}(\Omega)$ with respect to parameters X. Observe that parametric part $[j_{v_0}, \rho_{v_0}]$ in the root equation $\Omega = \Omega_{v_0}$ of the tree $T_{sol}(\Omega)$ is partitioned into a disjoint union of closed sections corresponding to X-bases and constant bases (this follows from the construction of the initial equations in the set $\mathcal{GE}_{par}(S)$). We label every closed section σ corresponding to a variable $x \in X^{\pm 1}$ by x, and every constant section corresponding to a constant a by a. Due to our construction of the tree $T_{sol}(\Omega)$ moving along a branch B from the initial vertex v_0 to a terminal vertex v, we transfer all the bases for a minimal solution from the active and non-active parts into parametric parts until, eventually, in Ω_v the whole interval consists of the parametric part. Observe also that, moving along B in the parametric part, we neither introduce new closed sections nor delete any. All we do is we split (sometimes) an item in a closed parametric section into two new ones. In any event we keep the same label of the section.

Now for a terminal vertex v in $T_{sol}(\Omega)$ we construct a cut equation $\Pi'_v = (\mathcal{E}_v, f_{X_v}, f_{M_v})$ as in Lemma 1 taking the set of all closed sections of Ω_v as the partition X_v. The set of cut equations

$$\mathcal{CE}'(S) = \{\Pi'_v \mid \Omega \in \mathcal{GE}_{par}(S), v \in VTerm(T_{sol}(\Omega))\}$$

satisfies all the requirements of the theorem except X_v might not be equal to X. To satisfy this condition we adjust slightly the equations Π'_v.

To do this, we denote by $l : X_v \to X^{\pm 1} \cup A^{\pm 1}$ the labelling function on the set of closed sections of Ω_v. Put $\Pi_v = (\mathcal{E}_v, f_X, f_{M_v})$ where f_X is the composition of f_{X_v} and l. The set of cut equations

$$\mathcal{C}E(S) = \{\Pi_v \mid \Omega \in \mathcal{G}E_{par}(S), v \in VTerm(T_{sol}(\Omega))\}$$

satisfies all the conditions of the theorem. This follows from [[4]], Theorem 5 and from Lemma 1. Indeed, to satisfy 3) one can take the words $P_{i,V}$ that correspond to a minimal solution of Π_i, i.e., the words $P_{i,V}$ can be obtained from a given particular way to transfer all bases from Y-part onto X-part.

□

3 Proof of Theorem 2

By Theorem 1, every definable set is defined by a boolean combination of ∃∀-formulas. By Lemma 10 [4], every ∃∀-formula is equivalent to

$$\exists X \forall Y (V(X, Y, P) = 1 \to U(Y) = 1),$$

where X, Y, P are tuples of variables.

This formula has form (25) in [5], namely

$$\phi(P) = \forall Z \exists X \forall Y (V(X, Y, P) = 1 \to U(Y) = 1). \tag{4}$$

The proof of Theorem 39 in Section 12.7 of [5] shows that the formula $\phi(P)$ is false for a value $\bar{P}$ of the variables P if and only if the conjunction of disjunctions of formulas of the two types given below is true for $\bar{P}$. We will write these formulas in the same form as they appear in Section 12.7 of [5]. Notice that instead of the union of variables $X_1, Y_1, \ldots, X_{k-1}$ in these formulas we take variables P.

$$\exists Z_{k-1} \forall B, C(U(P, Z_{k-1}) = 1 \wedge V(P, Z_{k-1}, B, C) \neq 1), \tag{5}$$

$$\forall Z_{k-1} \exists B(U'(P, Z_{k-1}) = 1 \to V'(P, Z_{k-1}, B) = 1. \tag{6}$$

The first formula is in the form (1). The negation of the second formula is also in the form (1). We give more details in Section 7 concerning formulas (5) and (6).

4 Proof of Theorem 3

We prove the first statement of the theorem first. We think about $U(Y, P) = 1$ as an equation with coefficients A and two sets of variables: $X = P$ and Y. Construct the finite set of cut equations for $U(P, Y, A) = 1$ (that plays the role of $S(X, Y, A) = 1$). There is at least one interval $\sigma_j \in \mathcal{E}$ labeled by p_j that is completely covered by variables from M and constants (=coefficients). Each variable y_i from M appears at least twice in each of these cut equations, otherwise we can remove the partition containing y_i and express y_i in terms of other variables and p_i. Formula $\psi(P)$ does not define the whole group F^m. Suppose it doesn't define finite or empty set. So at least one $f_X(\sigma_j)$ can be represented in several ways as a product without cancellation in the form (3). Variables from M correspond to pieces of a reduced word $f_X(\sigma_j)$ corresponding to p_j. To find a group solution of the cut equation we can remove all matching variables. If for a word w_{ij} in (3) some variable is removed from this word, then there is no restriction on the value of p_j given by equation $p_j = w_{ij}(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$. If there are no restrictions on the value of p_j at all, p_j can be arbitrary element of f. If this happens for each j, the formula $\exists Y U(Y, P) = 1$ defines F^m (unless each p_j is a constant and the formula defines finite or empty set, but we assumed this is not the case). Therefore at least one of the words, say w_{1j} is unchanged after removing of matching variables.

If $\psi(P)$ does not define the whole group F^m, then by the first statement of the theorem, $\psi_1(P)$ defines a subset of the multipattern and is a sub-multipattern. Suppose now that $\psi(P)$ defines the whole group F^m . Then $\psi_1(P)$ is equivalent to $\psi_2(P) = \exists Y_1 U_1(Y_1) = 1 \wedge V_1(Y_1, P) \neq 1$. Let us prove this.

Parameters satisfying $\psi(P)$ are described by disjunction of cut equations, and one of the cut equations defines the whole group F^m (denote it Π_1), therefore this cut equation can be described by the formula $\exists M U_1(M) = 1$. Every element from Y corresponding to the set P_1 described by this cut equation can be represented as a function $f(M, P, A)$. The system of equations consisting of $V(f(M, P, A), P) = 1$ for all such functions $f(M, P, A)$, by the Noetherian property, is equivalent to one equation $V_1(M, P) = 1$. If $\bar{P} \notin P_1$, then $\bar{P}$ satisfies the formula

$$\forall M(U_1(M) = 1 \rightarrow V_1(M, \bar{P}) = 1).$$

Since there exists M such that $U_1(M) = 1$, elements from $\bar{P}$ either constitute the whole F^m or form a disjunction of cut equations, therefore form a multipattern. If these elements form F^m, then $\psi_1(P)$ is false for all parameters satisfying cut equation Π_1. Then we consider the next cut equation corresponding to the equation $U(Y, P) = 1$ and defining the whole group F^m (if exists). If parameters satisfying one of such cup equations form a non-empty set, then $\neg P$ is a sub-multipattern, otherwise P is a sub-multipattern.

5 Proof of Theorem 4

We can now prove Theorem 4. Consider formula (1).

If the $\exists$-set defined by $\exists X(U(P, X) = 1)$ is not the whole group F^m, then the set P defined by the formula (1) is a sub-multipattern.

Suppose now that the set defined by $\exists X(U(P, X) = 1$ is the whole group, then, as in the proof of Theorem 3, a subset of parameters satisfying formula (1) is a sub-multipattern and another subset is defined by

$$\exists X_1 \forall Y(U_1(X_1) = 1 \wedge V_1(X_1, Y, P) \neq 1).$$

Suppose this formula does not define the empty set. Then the negation is

$$\phi_1(P) = \forall X_1 \exists Y(U_1(X_1) = 1 \rightarrow V_1(X_1, Y, P) = 1).$$

Lemma 2. *Formula*

$$\theta(P) = \forall X_1 \exists Y(U_1(X_1) = 1 \rightarrow V_1(X_1, Y, P) = 1)$$

in F in the language L_A is equivalent to the condition that a positive $\exists$-formula $\exists Y V_2(P, Y) = 1$ holds in some NTQ group N.

Proof. We can assume that the equation $U_1(X_1) = 1$ is irreducible. By [4] each solution of this equation factors through one of the finite number of NTQ-systems. By [4], Theorem 12, formula $\exists Y V_2(P, Y) = 1$ holds in one of the corrective normalizing extensions of one of the NTQ systems. For any value $\bar{P}$ of variables P that makes each such formula true in each of the NTQ groups, this value also makes $\theta(P)$ true.

□

Since $\neg P \neq F^m$, by this lemma, it must be a multi-pattern.

6 Negligible sets

Definition 5. *[3] A subset P of F is* negligible *if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that all but finitely many $p \in P$ have a piece such that*

$$\frac{length(piece)}{length(p)} \geq \epsilon.$$

A complement of a negligible subset is co-negligible.

Bestvina and Feighn [3] stated that in the language without constants every definable subset of F is either negligible or co-negligible. They also proved

Proposition 1. *[3] 1) Subsets of negligible sets are negligible.*
2) Finite sets are negligible.
3) A subset S containing a coset of a non-cyclic subgroup G of F cannot be negligible
4) A proper non-cyclic subgroup of F is neither negligible nor co-negligible.
5) The set of primitive elements of F is neither negligible nor co-negligible if $rank(F) > 2$.

Proof. Statements 1) and 2) immediately follow from the definition. 3) If $x, y \in G$ and $[x, y] \neq 1$, then the infinite set $\{fxyxy^2x \dots xy^ix,\ i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is not negligible . Statement 4) follows from 3). 5) Let a, b, c be three elements in the basis of F and denote $F_2 = F(a, b)$ The set of primitive elements contains cF_2, and the complement contains $< [a, b], c^{-1}[a, b]c >$.

□

Lemma 3. *A set $P \subseteq F$ that is a sub-multipattern, is negligible.*

Proof. It is enough to show that a set $P \subseteq F$ that admits parametrization is negligible. Let m be the length of word w_1 (as a word in variables y_i's and constants). The set P is negligible with $\epsilon = 1/m$. □

Corollary 3. *Every definable subset of F in the language with constants (and, therefore, in the language without constants) is either negligible or co-negligible.*

Definition 6. *Recall that in complexity theory $T \subseteq F(X)$ is called generic if*

$$\rho_n(T) = \frac{|T \cap B_n(X)|}{|B_n|} \to 1,\ if\ n \to \infty,$$

where $B_n(X)$ is the ball of radius n in the Cayley graph of $F(X)$. The term "negligible" is usually used for a complement of a generic set. We will call in this paper such a set CT-negligible.

Proposition 2. *Negligible sets in Definition 5 are CT-negligible.*

Proof. Let $2|X| = k$. Then $|B_n| = (k/k-2)((k-1)^n - 1)$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Let N be the set of words w that have a piece such that

$$\frac{|piece|}{|w|} \geq \epsilon.$$

If $|w| = n$, then $|piece| \geq m = \epsilon n$. We now count the number of reduced words of length n that have a piece of length m (if they have a piece longer than m, then they also have a piece of length m). There are $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ choices for positions of the first letters of the pieces. Suppose these positions are fixed, one piece begins at position i and the other at position j. Then there are two cases :

1) If the pieces of length m do not overlap, then up to a constant there are at most $(k-1)^{n-2m}(k-1)^m = (k-1)^{n-m}$ such words;

2) If the pieces of length m overlap, and $j = i + t$, then up to a constant there are at most $(k-1)^{n-m-t}(k-1)^t = (k-1)^{n-m}$ such words.

Therefore up to a constant there are at most $n(n-1)(k-1)^{n-m}$ reduced words of length n that have a piece of length $m=\epsilon n$. Let $P_{n,\epsilon}$ be the set of reduced words in B_n that have a piece of length m, $m=\epsilon n$. $|P_{n,\epsilon}|$ is at most $C\sum_{i=1}^{n} i(i-1)(k-1)^{i(1-\epsilon)}$, where C is a constant.

It is known that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} iz^i = z\frac{1-(n+1)z^n+nz^{n+1}}{(1-z)^2},$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} i^2z^i = z\frac{1+z-(n+1)^2z^n+(2n^2+2n-1)z^{n+1}-n^2z^{n+2}}{(1-z)^3}.$$

Using these formulas with $z=(k-1)^{(1-\epsilon)}$, we obtain that $|P_{n,\epsilon}|\leq C_1n^2(k-1)^{(1-\epsilon)n}$, where C_1 is a constant.

Then $\rho_n \leq \frac{C_1n^2(k-1)^{(1-\epsilon)n}}{(k-1)^n} = C_1\frac{n^2}{(k-1)^{n\epsilon}}$. Therefore $\rho_n \to 0$, as $n\to\infty$. □

7 Groups with no sufficient splitting and conjunctive ∃∀-formulas

To make this paper more self-contained we will give more explanations how formulas (5) and (6) are obtained in [5]. In Section 5.4 of [5] we defined the notion of a sufficient splitting of a group K modulo a class of subgroups $\mathcal{K}$. Let F be a free group with basis A, $P=A\cup\{p\}$, $H=<p>*F$. Let $\mathcal{K}$ consist of one subgroup $\mathcal{K}=\{H\}$. The set of specializations p such that formula (4) is true in F is associated with a finite number of groups without sufficient splitting modulo H and for each such group K with a given combination of Max-classes of algebraic solutions. The total number of such classes is bounded by Theorem 11 in [5]. Let $H\leq K$ and $K=<X,P|S(X,P)>$ does not have a sufficient splitting modulo H. Let D be an abelian JSJ decomposition of K modulo H.

We recall the notion of algebraic solutions. Let K_1 be a fully residually free quotient of the group K, $\kappa : K\to K_1$ the canonical epimorphism, and $H_1=H^{\kappa}$ the canonical image of H in K_1. An elementary abelian splitting of K_1 modulo H_1 which does not lift into K is called a *new* splitting.

Definition 7. *(Definition 20 [5]) In the notation above the quotient K_1 is called* reducing *if one of the following holds:*

1. *K_1 has a non-trivial free decomposition modulo H_1;*
2. *K_1 has a new elementary abelian splitting modulo H_1.*

We say that a homomorphism $\phi : K\to K_1$ is *special* if ϕ either maps an edge group of D to the identity or maps a non-abelian vertex group of D to an abelian subgroup.

Let $\mathcal{R}=\{K/R(r_1),\dots,K/R(r_s)\}$ be a complete reducing system for K (see [5]). Now we define algebraic and reducing solutions of $S=1$ in F with respect to $\mathcal{R}$. Let $\phi : H\to F$ be a fixed F-homomorphism and Sol_ϕ the set of all homomorphisms from K onto F which extend ϕ. A solution $\psi\in Sol_\phi$ is called *reducing* if there exists a solution $\psi'\in Sol_\phi$ in the $\sim_{MAX}$-equivalence class of ψ which satisfies one of the equations $r_1=1,\dots,r_k=1$ (more precise, which factors through the corrective extension of one of the groups $K/R(r_i)$). All non-reducing non-special solutions from Sol_ϕ are called *K-algebraic* (modulo H and ϕ).

Theorem 6. *Let $H\leq K$ be as above. The fact that for parameters P there are exactly N non-equivalent Max-classes of K-algebraic solutions of the equation $S(X,P)=1$ modulo H can be written as a boolean combination of conjunctive ∃∀-formulas.*

The generating set X of K corresponding to the decomposition D can be partition as $X=X_1\cup X_2$ such that $G=<X_2\cup P>$ is the fundamental group of the graph of groups obtained from D by removing all QH-subgroups. If c_e is a given generator of an edge group of D, then we know how AE-transformation σ associated with edge e acts on the generators from the set X. Namely, if $x \in X$ is a generator of a vertex group, then either $x^\sigma = x$ or $x^\sigma = c^{-m}xc^m$, where c is a root of the image of c_e in F, or in case e is an edge between abelian and rigid vertex groups and x belongs to the abelian vertex group, $x^\sigma = xc^m$. Similarly, if x is a stable letter then either $x^\sigma = x$ or $x^\sigma = xc^m$.

One can write elements c_e as words in generators X_2, $c_e = c_e(X_2)$. Denote $T = \{t_i,\ i = 1, \dots, m\}$. Consider a formula

$$\begin{aligned}&\exists X_1 \exists X_2 \forall Y \forall T \forall Z\, (S(X_1, X_2, P) = 1\\ &\qquad \wedge \neg \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{m} [t_i, c_i(X_2)] = 1 \wedge Z = X_2^{\sigma_T} \wedge S(Y, X_2, P) = 1 \wedge V(Y, Z, P) = 1 \right)\Bigg).\end{aligned}$$

It says that there exists a solution of the equation $S(X_1, X_2, P) = 1$ that is not Max-equivalent to a solution Y, Z, P that satisfies $V(Y, Z, P) = 1$. If now $V(Y, Z, P) = 1$ is a disjunction of equations defining (corrective extensions of) maximal reducing quotients, then this formula states that for parameters P there exists at least one Max-class of algebraic solutions of $S(X, P) = 1$ with respect to H.

Denote $\tau(T, X_2, Y, Z) = (\bigwedge_{i=1}^{m} [t_i, c_i(X_2)] = 1 \wedge Z = X_2^{\sigma_T} \wedge S(Y, X_2, P) = 1 \wedge V(Y, Z, P) = 1)$. The following formula states that for parameters P there exists at least two non-equivalent Max-classes of algebraic solutions of $S(X, P) = 1$ with respect to H.

$$\begin{aligned}&\theta_2(P) = \exists X_1, X_3 \exists X_2, X_4 \forall Y, Y' \forall T, T', T'' \forall Z, Z'\, (S(X_1, X_2, P) = 1 \wedge S(X_3, X_4, P) = 1\\ &\qquad \wedge \neg \left(\tau(T, X_2, Y, Z) \vee \tau(T', X_4, Y', Z') \vee (\bigwedge_{i=1}^{m} [t_i{''}, c_i(X_2)] = 1 \wedge X_2^{\sigma_{T''}} = X_4) \right)\Bigg).\end{aligned}$$

Both these formulas have type (5). Similarly one can write a formula $\theta_N(P)$ that states for parameters P there exists at least N non-equivalent Max-classes of algebraic solutions of $S(X, P) = 1$ with respect to H.

Then $\theta_N(P) \wedge \neg \theta_{N+1}(P)$ states that there are exactly N non-equivalent Max-classes. The theorem is proved.

We will recall now how formulas (5),(6) appear in [5]. In Section 12 in [5], parameters P always correspond to variables $X_1, Y_1, \dots, X_{k-1}$. The tree T_{X_k} is finite, we can have schemes of levels $(1, 0), (1, 1,), (2, 1), (2, 2)$ etc up to some number (m, m). We will concentrate on level $(2, 1)$. In Definition 27 we define initial fundamental sequences of levels $(2, 1)$ and $(2, 2)$ and width i (the possible width is bounded) modulo $P =< X_1, Y_1, \dots, X_{k-1} >$. All conditions (1)-(5) in this definition can be expressed by boolean combinations of conjunctive $\exists\forall$ formulas (depending on $X_1, Y_1, \dots, X_{k-1}$). Lemmas 27 and 28 reduce the analysis of the set of parameters $P =< X_1, Y_1, \dots, X_{k-1} >$ for which there exists a fundamental sequence of level $(2, 1)$ and width i to those for which for this fundamental sequence there exists a generic family of values of the variables $Y_{k-1}^{(1)}, Z_{k-1}^{(2,j,s)}, Y_{k-1}^{(2,j,s)}$, $j = 1, \dots, i_s,\ s = 1, \dots, t,\ Z_{k-1}^{(3,k)}$ with properties (1)–(5) from Definition 27. Similarly, Lemma 29 reduces the analysis of the set of parameters $P =< X_1, Y_1, \dots, X_{k-1} >$ for which there exists a fundamental sequence of level $(2, 2)$ and width i to those for which for this fundamental sequence there exists a generic family of values of the variables $Y_{k-1}^{(1)}, Z_{k-1}^{(2,j,s)}, Y_{k-1}^{(2,j,s)}$, $j = 1, \dots, i_s,\ s = 1, \dots, t,\ Z_{k-1}^{(3,k)}$ with properties (1)–(6) from Definition 28.

For a given value of $X_1, Y_1, \dots, X_{k-1}$ formula

$$\Psi = \forall Y_{k-1} \exists X_k \forall Y_k (U(X_1, Y_1, \dots, X_k, Y_k) = 1 \to V(X_1, Y_1, \dots, X_k, Y_k) = 1) \tag{7}$$

cannot be proved on level less than (2,1) if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.

(a) There exist algebraic solutions for some $U_{i,coeff} = 1$ corresponding to the terminal group of a fundamental sequence $V_{i,\text{fund}}$ satisfying possibility (i) in Lemma 27, namely for this fundamental sequence there exists a generic family of values of the variables $Y_{k-1}^{(1)}, Z_{k-1}^{(2,j,s)}, Y_{k-1}^{(2,j,s)}$, $j = 1, \ldots, i_s,\ s = 1, \ldots, t,\ Z_{k-1}^{(3,k)}$ with properties (1)–(5) from Definition 27.

(b) There is no algebraic solutions for equations corresponding to the terminal groups of fundamental sequences that describe solutions from $V_{i,\text{fund}}$ that do not satisfy one of properties (1)-(5). There is a finite number of such fundamental sequences.

(c) There is no algebraic solutions for equations corresponding to the terminal groups of fundamental sequences of level (2,1) and greater depth derived from $V_{i,\text{fund}}$.

(d) $(X_1, Y_1, \ldots, Y_{k-1}, Y_{k-1}^{(1)})$ cannot be extended to a solution of $V = 1$ by arbitrary X_k (X_k of level 0) and Y_k of level (1,0).

For a given value of $X_1, Y_1, \ldots, X_{k-1}$ formula (7) can be disproved on level $(2,1)$ if and only if it cannot be proved on level less than $(2,1)$ and there is no algebraic solutions for equations corresponding to the terminal groups of fundamental sequences of level (2,2) corresponding to $V_{i,\text{fund}}$. These conditions can be described by a boolean combination of conjunctive ∃∀-formulas of type (5).

8 Torsion free hyperbolic groups

In this section G is a non-elementary torsion free hyperbolic group.

Theorem 7. *Let G be a non-elementary torsion free hyperbolic group. Every set definable in G is defined by some boolean combination of conjunctive ∃∀-formulas.*

Proof. The statement of the theorem can be proved the same way as for the free group case.

It also can be obtained from Sela's work [10] as follows. Similarly to Theorem 6.5 [10] one can prove that $EAE(p)$ (we use Sela's notation) is in the boolean algebra of conjunctive ∃∀ sets. Indeed $EAE(p) = T_1(p) \cup \ldots T_d(p)$, where d is the depth of the tree of stratified sets. , and $T_n(p)$ is the set of specializations of the defining parameters P for which there exists a valid PS statement for some proof system of depth n. Lemma 6.2 in [10] deals with $T_1(p)$. The proof that $T_1(p)$ is a conjunctive ∃∀ set is identical to the free group case. Theorem 6.3 [10] deals with $T_2(p)$. As in the free group case, Proposition 3.7 [9] (the proof of this proposition is not given there but it is stated that it is identical to the proof of Proposition 1.34 [9]) reduces the analysis of the set $T_2(p)$ to the set of specializations of the defining parameters $P =< p >$ for which there exists a test sequence of valid PS statements that factors through the various resolutions $PSHGHRes$. By construction, if $p_0 \in T_2(p)$ then there must exist a valid PS statement of the form

$$(r, (h_1^2, g_1^1), \ldots, (h_{d(ps)}^2, g_{d(ps)}^1), h_0^1, w_0, p_0, a)$$

that factors through one of the PS resolutions PSHGHRes constructed with respect to all proof systems of depth 2. (Notice that the notion of a resolution corresponds to the notion of a fundamental sequence in our work.) The sets $TSPS(p)$ associated with various PS resolutions $PSHGHRes$, i.e. the sets of specializations p_0 of defining parameters $P =< p >$ for which there exists a test sequence (test sequence corresponds to a generic family) that factors through any of the PS resolutions $PSHGHRes$ and restricts to valid PS statements are in the Boolean algebra of ∃∀ sets (Proposition 1.34, [9]). Moreover, it follows from the proof of Proosition 1.34 that for any specialization p_0 of the defining parameters, there are finitely many combinations for the collections of ungraded resolutions covered by a PS resolution $PSHGHRes$, and the collections of ungraded resolutions covered by the other (auxiliary) graded resolutions associated with $PSHGHRes$. These finitely many possibilities for the collections of ungraded resolutions form a stratification on the set of specializations of the defining parameters, obtained from the bases of all the graded resolutions that have been constructed. Therefore $p_0 \in TSPS(p)$ if and only if it belongs to certain strata in the combined stratification , and not to the complement of these strata, but it depends only on the stratum, not on the particular specialization. A stratum in the stratification is the set of specializations for which there exists a given combination of rigid and strictly solid families of specializations (= Max-classes) of finitely many rigid or solid limit groups (= groups without sufficient splitting). These sets of specializations can be defined by a Boolean combination of conjunctive $\exists\forall$ formulas. By Theorem 1.33 in [9], if there exists a valid PS statement that factors through a PS resolution $PSHGHRes$, then either there exists a test sequence that factors through this resolution and restricts to valid PS statements, or there must exist a combined specialization that factors through a resolution of lower complexity, and we can continue with this resolution. The definition of a valid PS statement is given in Definition 1.23 [9]. The fact that for a specialization p_0 there exists a valid PS statement that factors through a PS resolution $PSHGHRes$ can be expressed by a Boolean combination of conjunctive $\exists\forall$ formulas, because conditions (i)-(iv) in this definition can be expressed by such formulas.

Each set $T_n(p)$ is in the boolean algebra of conjunctive $\exists\forall$ sets , by applying the same sieve procedure that is used to analyze the set $T_2(p)$. □

Definition 8. *Suppose G is generated by the set A, therefore G is a quotient of the free group $F = F(A)$. A proper subset P of G^m admits parametrization if P is the image of the set $\tilde{P}$ in F^m that admits parametrization in F and there exist constants λ and D such that for each $p = (p_1, \ldots, p_m) \in P$ there is a pre-image $\tilde{p} = (\tilde{p}_1, \ldots, \tilde{p}_m) \in \tilde{P}$ such that the path corresponding to each $\tilde{p}_i$ in the Cayley graph of G is λ-quasigeodesic in D neighborhood of the geodesic p_i.*

The empty set and one-element subsets of G^m admit parametrization.

A finite union of sets admitting parametrization will be called a multipattern. *A subset of a multipattern will be called* a sub-multipattern

Theorem 8. *For every definable subset P of non-elementary torsion free hyperbolic group G^m, P or its complement $\neg P$ is a sub-multipattern.*

Proof. We only have to show the set defined by the positive existential formula

$$\exists Y U(P, Y, A) = 1,$$

where elements in A are constants, is a sub-multipattern if it is not the whole group.

In [7], the problem of deciding whether or not a system of equations S over a torsion-free hyperbolic group G has a solution was solved by constructing quasigeodesics called *canonical representatives* for certain elements of G. This construction reduced the problem to deciding the existence of solutions in finitely many systems of equations over free groups. The reduction may also be used to describe parameters P as shown below.

Lemma 4. *[7] Let $G =< A|R >$ be a torsion-free δ-hyperbolic group and $\pi : F(A) \to G$ the canonical epimorphism. There is an algorithm that, given a system $S(Z, A) = 1$ of equations over Γ, produces finitely many systems of equations*

$$S_1(X_1, A) = 1, \ldots, S_n(X_n, A) = 1 \tag{8}$$

over F and homomorphisms $\rho_i : F(Z, A) \to F_{R(S_i)}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ such that

1. *for every F-homomorphism $\phi : F_{R(S_i)} \to F$, the induced map $\overline{\rho_i \phi \pi} : \Gamma_{R(S)} \to \Gamma$ is a Γ-homomorphism, and*

2. *for every Γ-homomorphism $\psi : \Gamma_{R(S)} \to \Gamma$ there is an integer i and an F-homomorphism $\phi : F_{R(S_i)} \to F(A)$ such that $\overline{\rho_i \phi \pi} = \psi$.*

Moreover, the algorithm also gives positive numbers λ and D such that for each solution $\psi(Z)$ of $S(Z, A) = 1$ the corresponding words $\phi(\rho_i(Z))$ in $F(A)$ represent λ-quasigeodesics in the D neighborhood of corresponding elements in $\psi(Z)$.

By this lemma the set of parameters P defined by the formula $\exists Y U(P, Y, A) = 1$ consists of the images of the set of parameters satisfying the formula $\exists Y W(Y, P, A) = 1$ for certain system of equations $\exists Y W(Y, P, A) = 1$ is $F(A)$. This proves that this set is a sub-multipattern. Now the proof of the theorem is the same as in the free group case. □

Theorem 9. *Proper non-cyclic subgroups in a non-elementary torsion free hyperbolic group G are not definable.*

Proof. Let H be a non-cyclic subgroup in G. Let a, b be two non-commuting elements in H such that they generate a quasiconvex free subgroup in G. Such elements exist by [1]. Let $x = a^n, y = b^m$ where n, m are sufficiently large numbers so that the set of elements $\{P_i = xyxy^2x \dots xy^ix,\ i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ consists of λ_1-quasigeodesics in the D_1-neighborhood of corresponding geodesics. Such numbers n, m exist by [1]. By increasing, if necessary, λ and D from the previous theorem we can assume that $\lambda_1 = \lambda$ and $D_1 = D$.

Elements $\{P_i\}$ can be represented by quasigeodesics Q_i that have pieces $R_i = \bar{R}_i$ of length greater than $\epsilon|Q_i|$. We have one of the following two cases.

1) There is a number δ and a subsequence of indices $\{i_j\}$ such that the non-overlapping part of R_{i_j} and $\bar{R}_{i_j}$ in Q_{i_j} is greater than $\delta|Q_i|$.

2) There is a subsequence of indices $\{i_j\}$ such that Q_{i_j} have periodic subwords of length greater than $\epsilon|Q_{i_j}|$.

In the second case, since quasigeodesics P_{i_j} and Q_{i_j} are $2D$ close to each other, such long periodic subwords must appear in the elements P_{i_j}. This contradicts to the form of the elements.

In the first case, since quasigeodesics P_{i_j} and Q_{i_j} are $2D$ close to each other, two pieces in P_{i_j} of length greater than $\epsilon|P_{i_j}|$ are $4D$ close to each other. This again contradicts to the form of the elements P_{i_j}. The theorem is proved. □

References

[1] G.N. Arzhantseva, *On quasiconvez subgroups of word hyperbolic groups*, Geometriae dedicata, 87, 191-208, 2001.

[2] J.L. Brenner, R.C. Lyndon, *Permutations and cubic graphs*, Pacific Journal of Maths, v.104, 285–315

[3] M. Feighn (joint with M. Bestvina), *Talk on negligible sets: Luminy, France*, June 2010, M. Feighn's homepage at Rutgers, http://andromeda.rutgers.edu/ feighn/.

[4] O. Kharlampovich and A. Myasnikov, *Implicit function theorem over free groups*, Journal of Algebra, vol 290/1, pp. 1–203, 2005.

[5] O. Kharlampovich and A. Myasnikov, *Elementary theory of free non-abelian groups*, Journal of Algebra , 302, Issue 2, 451-552, 2006.

[6] Kourovka Notebook: Unsolved Problems in Group Theory (American Mathematical Society Translations Series 2) by Kourovskaia Tetrad. English, L. Ia Leifman and D. J. Johnson (Aug 1983)

[7] E. Rips, Z. Sela, Canonical representatives and equations in hyperbolic groups, Inventiones Mathematicae, v. 120, no 3, 1995, 489-512.

[8] Z. Sela. *Diophantine geometry over groups V: Quantifier elimination.*, GAFA 16(2006), 707-730.

[9] Z. Sela, Diophantine geometry over groups. V1. Quantifier elimination. I. Israel J. Math. 150 (2005), 1197.

[10] Z. Sela, Diophantine geometry over groups. VII. The elementary theory of a hyperbolic group. Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) 99 (2009), no. 1, 217273.